

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

March 23, 1998

RECEIVED
MARCH 24 1998
FCC MAIL ROOMVia Federal Express

Ms. Magalie R. Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte Communication – WT Docket 96-86

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed herewith for filing with the Commission are two (2) copies an E-Mail to John Clark.

Please stamp and return one (1) copy to my attention in the enclosed self-addressed FedEx envelope.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Robert J. Speidel, Esq.
Manager, Regulatory Programs

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd 021
List A B C D E



Certificate Number FM 11374EUS/L

Robert Speidel

From: Robert Speidel
Sent: Friday, March 20, 1998 3:08 PM
To: 'John Clark'
Cc: Barbara Baffer
Subject: Ericsson Plans

John:

Barbara called me after your meeting today, and suggested that I write to you about our plans for future Land mobile radio. She said there may have been some confusion concerning our Project 25 Phase 2 plans, and does our plan also include a Phase 1 offering. Possibly, there may have been some misunderstanding about the presentation made by Dominick Arcuri to the Steering Committee after the last PSWN meeting in Sacramento.

The easiest thing for me to say, is that Ericsson does not have any intention at this time of developing or producing a compliant Phase 1 system. If you consider the fact that Project 25 is actually a set or suite of documents/specifications describing a number of interfaces/features of a land mobile radio system, and you compare alleged Project 25 systems being delivered today, it quickly becomes evident that no system today, and probably for the foreseeable future, is truly a Project 25 compliant system. You could argue that NOBODY will ever produce a compliant Phase 1 system. For sure, systems being delivered today and touted as Project 25 compliant may comply with SOME of the array of specifications which make up the Project 25 standard, but no alleged Project 25 system complies with ALL of the specifications. For example I know of no alleged Project 25 system delivered to date which complies with the Project 25 trunking specification. In fact if you were at the Project 25 presentation during the APCO convention last August, you heard the Motorola presenter acknowledge that their Project 25 system did not incorporate 9600 baud control channel nor did this presenter provide any details concerning migration to a 9600 baud control channel for the alleged Project 25 systems that had already been delivered.

Our concept for Project 25, and what I think was said in Sacramento, was that the "dual tracks" consist of an interoperability pipe and a working channel pipe. Commonality may be required in the interoperability pipe, and it might be a conventional Phase 1 CAI, but it could also be some other common technology such as analog FM. This could easily be determined by the customer since some may want interoperability in digital modes and others (possibly the vast majority of existing licensees) would want analog FM. From the comments I have reviewed it seems that many if not all of the commenters believe that analog FM must be an option. Please remember that the CAI is just one of the numerous interfaces that make up a true Project 25 system. We have not in the past agreed that the Project 25 technology track was the best choice for the users, and we still strongly hold these beliefs. Furthermore, the market dynamics existing today, clearly validate what we said years ago about the competitive effects of Project 25.

Regardless, we want to see Project 25 reach its goals and we know that the dual track or multi track approach for Phase 2 is the only hope that it will ever realize these objectives. We are convinced that Dual or Multi Track will not only result in competition among manufacturers who might choose to build equipment that incorporates standardized technologies (however, due to the IPR situation manufacturers competing against each other using a single technology controlled by one of the manufacturers is unlikely), but more importantly will provide real competition among many technologies and many systems manufacturers to the ultimate benefit of the users. Yet at the same time required interoperability should be realized so long as the necessary commonality is provided in the interoperability pipe, and this commonality is done at the least common denominator.

However, please do not interpret our conciliatory attitude on Project 25 Phase 2 as an endorsement by us of Phase 1 or the Phase 1 process. We are convinced that mandating exclusive use of Project 25 Phase 1 (in the full sense of the word, i.e. mandating compliance with all of the specs that make up the standard), will result in either no system offerings being forthcoming, or in the more likely sense only one system manufacturer. Maybe, Phase 1 will provide some minimal competition in the terminal unit area, however, I can not believe that this minimal competition is to the benefit of the users when the "Big Picture" is analyzed.

I will go into this discussion in much greater detail when we meet on the 2nd. If there are some other topics that you wish to cover, please let me know ASAP so that I can tailor the presentation for maximum efficiency. I know that your time is quite precious at this moment and the last thing I want to do is use it less than efficiently.

If you think it is necessary to file this as an exparte, please let me know and I will do so. Of course, the presentation that we make on the 2nd will be filed.

Hope all is well with you and your family.

Bob Speidel